

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected and claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 are objected to. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made for cosmetic reasons to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action reject claims 1, 6, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. In light of the rejection, Applicant has amended the claims to include an access point in place of a central controller. In light of the above amendment, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,585 (“Hulyalkar”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in cited reference is a “connection controlling unit for connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal by said search controlling unit independent

of the plurality of access points.” This limitation is not present in the cited reference.

In Hulyalkar, as noted in the Office Action at page 5, “in an ad hoc network, there is still the requirement of a central controller to control the signal/control information and available slot allocation, and it is the data information between the WT (wireless terminal) and the CC (central controller) that is distributed such that each WT, during its slot ‘piggybacks’ its control information to the CC, where (among other control) messages it specifies the number of slots requested for the next CDF.” See Hulyalkar column 8, lines 29-36; Office Action at 5-6 (emphasis added).

In contrast, as explicitly recited in Applicant’s claim 1, the connection control unit for connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal by said search control unit is done independent of a central controller (the access point). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Independent claims 6 and 11 each require connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal independent of the plurality of access points. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Hulyalkar explicitly requires the central controller. See, column 8, lines 29-37; Office Action at pages 5-6. As such Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 6 and 11 and requests allowance of those claims.

Claims 2, 7, and 12 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hulyalkar and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2, 7, and 12 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 09/535,893

Docket No.: U1927.0008/P008

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs